

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

RE: INCOMPLETE ACTION WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMS 10-13

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 11-13 are "met for the same reasons already applied above" (i.e., for the reasons given with respect to claims 1-3). The Examiner also refers to sending and receiving data with respect to claims 11 and 12, and the Examiner refers to extracting data as recited in claim 13.

It is respectfully pointed out, however, that the Examiner does not mention the "imaging unit (8) which carries out image of said screen (S);" recited in claim 10. (The Examiner also does not refer to claim 10 in the discussion of the cited reference.) Claim 11 also recites "an imaging unit (8) which carries out imaging of said screen (S)." And claim 12 recites "a step of carrying out imaging of said screen, where said template image is projected."

Although the Examiner refers to the rejection of claims 1-3 as providing the reasons for the rejection of claims 11-13, original claims 1-3 did not recite an imaging unit or a step of carrying out imaging.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's action was incomplete with respect to claims 10-13, and it is respectfully submitted that if a new Office Action is issued containing a new ground of rejection with respect to the "imaging unit" or corresponding method step, such Office Action should not be made Final.

RE: THE CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claim 1 has been amended to recite an imaging unit which captures an image of the screen, and an image recording unit which stores an image captured by the imaging unit.

In addition, the claims have been amended to make some clarifying amendments, including some minor grammatical improvements and corrections of some minor antecedent basis problems so as to put them in better form for issuance in a U.S. patent.

No new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the amendments to the claims be approved and entered.

It is respectfully submitted, moreover, that the amendments to claims 2-13 are not related to patentability, and do not narrow the scope of the claims either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

Claims 1-3 and 10-13 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by US 2002/0055692 ("Tanaka et al"). This rejection, however, is respectfully traversed.

Tanaka et al discloses systems for the selection, display and storage of artificial bone templates. The Examiner asserts that display means 40 of Tanaka et al, which is a CRT or LCD, corresponds to the projection unit that projects an image on a screen as recited in, for example, independent claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that even if the Examiner's interpretation that the artificial bone template display of Tanaka et al corresponds to the projection unit of original claim 1 (for example) were reasonable, Tanaka et al still clearly would not disclose, teach or suggest an imaging unit which captures an image of the screen, and an image recording unit which stores an image captured by the imaging unit, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

As pointed out above, moreover, original independent claims 10-12 already contained recitations with respect to imaging a screen, and it is respectfully submitted that even if the Examiner's interpretation of Tanaka et al with respect to claim 1 were assumed to be reasonable, Tanaka et al still would not disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter of original claims 10-13.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 10-13 (along with the other claims) as amended to be put in better U.S. form hereinabove continue to clearly patentably distinguish over Tanaka et al.

With the structure of the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 10-12, for example, a stored template image may be projected onto a whiteboard. Characters, figures, etc., may be drawn on the whiteboard using a felt-tip pen, for example, and an image of the whiteboard can be captured to store the characters, figures, etc., written on the whiteboard on which the template image has been projected.

It is respectfully submitted that Tanaka et al clearly does not disclose, teach or suggest the structure or advantageous effects of the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 10-12.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 10-12, as well as claims 2-9 depending from claim 1, and claim 13 depending from claim 12, all clearly patentably distinguish over Tanaka et al, under 35 USC 102 as well as under 35 USC 103.

* * * * *

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No. (212) 319-5101

DH:iv:rjl
encs.